

REMARKS

By virtue of this amendment, claims 1-4, 6-27, and 29-42 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 17, 21, 29, and 32-42 have been amended. Claims 5 and 28 have been canceled without disclaimer or prejudice.

In an August 16, 2005 Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings, rejected claims 1, 2, 20-24, 27, 28, and 32 and objected to claims 3-19, 25, 26, and 29-31 as containing allowable subject matter but dependent on a rejected base claims. The applicants thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter and traverse the remaining objections and rejections.

In the office action, the Examiner objected to the drawings because the drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. In particular, the Examiner seems to consider the figures do not show the ground plane, the side walls, the radiating edge, and metal element. The applicants respectfully disagree.

For example, the ground plane is clearly shown in figure 10. Although the ground plane shown in figure 10 is specific to the prior art, the specification clearly states “the radiating element is spatially associated with a ground plane, much as is shown in prior art FIG. 10. (original specification paragraph [0034]). Moreover, the specification in paragraph [0034] further states “For purposes of simplification, the ground plane that is associated with embodiments of this invention is not shown in FIGS. 1-8,” which makes it clear to one of ordinary skill in the art that the ground plane associated with the present invention is a conventional ground plane as shown in FIG. 10.

Further, paragraph [0038] of the original specification states: “As shown in FIG. 1, a meandering metal segment 22 of radiating element 10 is provided within L-shaped slot 11” Metal segment 22 is clearly the same as the metal element of concern identified above. Moreover, one-to-one verbal correspondence between the written description and the claims is not necessary. One of ordinary skill in the art would understand without further disclosure that metal segment 22 sufficiently discloses the metal element identified by the Examiner. Moreover, at paragraph [0081] the written

description clearly states “the metal element that lies within the radiating element’s slot . . .” clearly identifies that metal segment 22 (which is in the slot) is sometimes referred to a metal element.

Referring to paragraph [0053] of the original specification, the specification states: “The is, feed post 14 is located on the **radiating edge 113** of radiating element 72” Clearly, the specific use of radiating edge 113 sufficiently discloses the radiating edge.

Regarding the side walls, the written description in several places identifies the slot as having walls. See for example, the Abstract (“the slot having side wall” and “without physically engaging the slot’s side walls”), paragraph [0039] (“equal distances from the adjacent walls of L-shaped slot 11”), paragraph [0040] (“adjacent walls of vertical section 19”), paragraph [0041] (“adjacent walls of L-shaped slot 11”), etc. It is respectfully submitted that the disclose of walls associated with the slot fully represents in the figures the side walls.

Based on the above, it is respectfully submitted that the figures sufficiently show the elements outlined by the Examiner. Thus, withdrawal of the objection of the drawings is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 21-24, 27, and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by United States Patent 6,380,905 (“Annamaa et al.”). The applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. In particular, amended claim 1 recites a combination of elements including, for example, “an extension of said radiating element where at least one part of the extension resides in the same plane as said radiating element and out of physical contact with said side walls,” which is not shown, disclosed, or suggested by Annamaa et al. The applicants respectfully suggest that the Examiner is reading more into the reference than it actually shows. It is respectfully submitted that Annamaa et al. as understood by one of ordinary skill in the art shows a radiating element comprising parts A1 and A2 of figure 1. Parts A1 and A2 are quasi separated using slot 115. As explained by Annamaa et al., “[t]he slot [115] divides the radiating element, viewed from the feed point F, into two branches A1 and

A2 which have different lengths. Thus, branch A1 and branch A2 are part of the single radiating element. And neither reside in the slot, rather the slot is a dividing line between the two branches. Thus, Annamaa et al. does not disclose “an extension of said radiating element where at least one part of the extension resides in the same plane as said radiating element and out of physical contact with said side walls.” Moreover, because the slot quasi divides the single radiating element into multiple sized elements, neither A1 nor A2 can reside in the slot 115. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Annamaa et al only discloses a radiating element consisting of parts A1 and A2 but does not disclose “an extension of said radiating element where at least one part of the extension resides in the same plane as said radiating element and out of physical contact with said side walls” as recited by amended claim 1.

For at least these reasons, amended claim 1 is patentably distinct from Annamaa et al. The applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of pending claim 1. Claims 21, 33 and 36 have been amended to contain recitations similar to amended claim 1 and, at least by virtue of the similarity are patentably distinct from Annamaa et al. The applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of pending claims 21, 33, and 36. Claims 2-4, 6-20, 22-27, 29-32, 34, 35, and 37-42 depend either directly or indirectly from claims 1, 21, 33, and 36 and, at least by virtue of the dependency, are patentably distinct from Annamaa et al.

The Examiner rejected claims 20 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable and obvious over Annamaa et al. in view of United States Patent Application Publication US2004/0001021 (“Choo et al.”). The Examiner contends that Annamaa et al. does not show the selection of either a microstrip antenna or a planar inverted F antenna. The Examiner relies on Choo et al. for the disclose. As an initial matter, Choo et al. does not cure the defect of Annamaa et al. noted above. Thus, because claims 20 and 32 are dependent on claim 1 and 21, respectively, they are patentably distinct from the combination of Annamaa et al. and Choo et al. However, the applicants are unsure whether the application of Choo et al. in relation to Annamaa et al. for the disclosure of a microstrip antenna is necessary as Annamaa et al. already discloses a planar inverted F antenna. Thus, if the applicants misinterpreted the

Examiner's reliance on Choo et al., the applicants respectfully request the Examiner issue a clarifying statement.

Based on the foregoing the applicants submit that claims 20 and 32 are patentably distinct from Annamaa et al. and Choo et al. either alone or in any reasonable combination thereof. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of pending claims 20 and 32 is respectfully requested.

For the foregoing reasons, withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

No claim related fees are believed to be due with this response. In the event any such fees are due, including fees for extension of time not otherwise provided, please consider this a request for such extension of time and debit Deposit Account 08-2623.

October 19, 2005



Brian Kinnear, Reg. No. 43,717
Attorney for Applicant
HOLLAND & HART LLP
555 17th Street, Suite 3200
Denver, Colorado 80201
Telephone: (303) 295-8170
Facsimile: (303) 295-8261